DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 087 SP 006 167

AUTHOR Anderson, Lowell D.
TITLE A Report on the Baltimore City Funded Project on Problems of Urban Vocational Schools Using a Cross-Discipline Team Teaching Model at Carver and Mergenthaler, Summer 1972.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Dept. of Industrial Education.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Disadvantaged Youth; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Special Education; *Summer Workshops; Teaching Methods; Team Teaching; *Urban Education; *Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

This report summarized the second of two workshops for teachers of disadvantaged and handicapped students in vocational schools in the urban setting. The workshop was jointly planned by the Vocational Division of the Baltimore City Public Schools and the University of Maryland. The departments of special and industrial education and the institute for child study from the college of education were represented. Goals for the workshop represented both the affective and cognitive domains of teacher behavior modification. Skills in defining instructional units using the case method, sensitivity to values of students, and attitudes of teachers were goals discussed. The methodology of the workshop involved cross-discipline team teaching which was modeled for vocational and academic teacher adoption. Evaluation of the workshop was based on participant rating of goal achievement, outside agencies, and the total workshop. Implementation of recommendations from the first workshop were included. (The related document is 006 128) (Author/BRB)

ED 073087

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:
SP VT UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

A REPORT ON THE BALTIMORE CITY FUNDED PROJECT ON PROBLEMS OF URBAN VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS USING A CROSS-DISCIPLINE TEAM TEACHING MODEL AT CARVER AND MERGENTHALER SUMMER 1972

submitted by
Dr. Lowell D. Anderson
Assistant Professor
Department of Industrial Education

The Vocational Division of the Baltimore Public Schools in conjunction with the Departments of Industrial Education and Special Education and the Institute for Child Study of the College of Education, University of Maryland, participated in a joint workshop during the summer of 1972 and academic year, 1972-73. The prime purpose of this workshop was to assist inner-city teachers in two vocational schools to deal more successfully with the disadvantaged and handicapped students. The model for the workshop, with some revision, was very similar to the successful model used in the 1971 summer workshop.

This report is submitted on behalf of the teaching and planning staff as an index of the success of the workshop. An attempt was made to implement recommendations which were proposed by both staff and participants of the 1971 workshop into the summer 72 workshop. Contracting for the workshop was extended to include eighteen meetings in the city schools with participants from both 71 and 72 workshops being eligible. This phase of the program will begin in September and continue for eighteen sessions during the school year.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1. THE WORKSHOP GOALS

The original nine workshop goals were developed through the combined efforts of Dr. Benjamin Whitten, Area Superintendent for Vocational Education, Baltimore Public Schools; Dr. Donald Maley, Chairman, Department of Industrial Education; Dr. Jean Hebeler, Chairman, Department of Special Education; and, Dr. H. Gerthon Morgan, Director, Institute for Child Study from the University of Maryland.

Participants rated the workshop on accomplishment of the nine goals using a four point scale: 4, excellent; 3, good; 2, fair; and 1, poor. These goals were:

A. Teachers will become sensitive to the problems of urban, or inner-city, or disadvantaged, or poverty students.

B. Teachers will recognize that there is more than one value system for behavior.

C. Teachers will study and plan application of innovative educational techniques.

D. Teachers will know and be able to use effective instructional methods with the learning handicaps of slow learners

E. Teachers will be exposed to the advantages of team teaching programs to make lessons more meaningful.

F. Teachers will cooperate so that a greater relationship is attained between the shop and academic studies.

G. Teachers will know and follow procedures that will tend to minimize the causes of discipline problems in the classroom.

H. Teachers will experiment with several methods of teaching and develop units for instruction.

I. Teachers will be able to write their program objectives behaviorally.

TABLE I

Participant Rating of the Success of the Workshop in Achieving its Goals

Goal		Rating Scale: Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	X
1 Sensitivity	f	6	14	4	2	26	3.0
2 Value system	f	15	10	0	1	26	3.5
3 Techniques	f	11	11	4	0	26	3.3
4 Methods	f	8	12	5	1	26	3.0
5 Team teaching	f	7	10	6	3	26	2.8
6 Relationships	f	12	10	3	1	26	3.3
7 Discipline	f	12	11	3	0	26	3.3
8 Instructional units	f	10	12	4	0	26	3.3
9 Behaviorial objectives	f	18	6	2	0	26	3.6

Participant rating of the success of the workshop in achievement of these goals (Table I) was high with a majority of the rat-

*The total number of participants was 28 but not all participants evaluated the objectives accounting for the N of 26.

ings occurring in the excellent or good range. Means for eight of the goals are above 3.0 while the means for goal five, team teaching, is 2.8.*

The high rating, 3.6 on writing behavior objectives, is interesting. It would tend to indicate that participants understood and could demonstrate the writing of behavior objectives. Application of this capability was not observed in the workshop but could become a part of the instructional program in the school.

II. WEEKLY EVALUATION SESSIONS

Evaluations sessions were conducted each Friday in an attempt to give the teaching staff an accounting of progress in achievement of performance goals. Each of the four evaluation sessions indicated three areas: first, rating by the participants on a high-low continuum scale indicating the degree of goal accomplishment, (the line continuum was converted into a five point scale for tabulation); second, a recorded session of the staff giving their analysis of weekly goal accomplishment; and, third, a recorded session of the participant representatives in assessment of accomplishment for the week.*

The fifteen performance goals on which participants responded were:

---

*The mean for the goal on team teaching for summer 1971 was 3.4. The teaching staff used the same team teaching strategies as the previous year but comments written by participants would appear to indicate that they did not perceive the staff team teaching as an adequate model which they could identify as team teaching for their use.

*The dialogue on the tapes is approximately two hours in duration and has not been analyzed. Tapes are available upon request.

1. I have been able to identify myself as a participant in the large group discussion sessions.

2. I have gained greater insight into my "self" as a person during this week.

3. I have evaluated my values and attitudes which I hold and believe in as a teacher.

4. I have gained the security to risk expressing my attitudes and values by understanding other people in the workshop.

5. I can apply the concept of cross-discipline planning to the development of my program.

6. I can make a clay-print relief transparency.

7. I can mount prints (dry or rubber cement) for class use.

8. I understand the diazo process for making a transparency.

9. I can make transparencies or copies using the thermofax process.

10. I understand the making of 8mm and 16mm visuals for classroom instruction.

11. I understand the meaning of the concept of career education.

12. I have some assessment of the value of vocational evaluation in diagnostic procedures to determine learner disabilities.

13. I have more clearly defined to myself the meaning of love.

14. I have gained insight into my perceptions of students through role playing and discussion.

15. My rating was (high, low) for use of full time.

TABLE II

Participant Rating on a One to Five Scale Indicating Achievement of Weekly Objectives

Objective	Week I X. N=26	Week II X N=27	Week III X N=25
1	2.6	2.4	3.0
2	2.5	3.0	3.0
3	2.7	3.2	3.5
4	2.5	3.1	3.0
5	2.8	3.1	3.0
6	3.2	3.8	3.0
7	3.1	2.6	3.5
8	3.1	2.1	2.9
9	1.7	3.0	3.1
10	3.1	3.5	2.5
11		3.3	3.4
12		3.3	3.4
13			3.0
14			3.4
15*			3.6

Responses to each of the fifteen objectives are presented in

*Objectives for each of the above items are listed in the dialogue. Not all objectives were given during the first week. Some objectives refer to specific demonstrations given by staff or specialists brought into the workshop.

Table II. It is difficult to assert that a general improvement was made by participants from week one to week three as indicated by the means of responses. Seemingly, the ratings on the third weeks evaluation are generally higher than those of week one. This could be accounted for by an increased enjoyment expressed by participants and correlated attitude changes towards their role and the functioning of the workshop. Personal relations become increasingly important as the workshop progresses, expecially in examining the affective nature of many of the goals of the workshop.

A general difference in perception about objective fifteen, use of free time, seemingly existed between the staff and the participants. Participants rating on use of free time is quite high; but, the subjective observation of staff members during free time periods was that participants were not pursuing tasks which had been introduced by the teaching staff. Differences in perception are more difficult to assess if a review of participants comments on improvement of the workshop is examined. A number of participants thought that the workshop could be improved by decreasing free time or increasing the supervision of participant's use of free time. Both recommendations appear quite inconsistent with the philosophical concept of the workshop; "that if teachers are given information, technical assistance and time, they can use these components effectively for teaching improvement."

III. THE TEACHING STAFF

The teaching staff was Dr. Lowell Anderson, Department of Industrial Education; Dr. Albert Gardner, Institute for Child Study;

and, Mr. Leonard Yellalonis, Department of Special Education. The instructional methods used could categorically be identified as primarily indirect. Demonstrations on teaching procedures, media, career education, objectives and related skill areas were presented through direct methodology. Organization of the workshop emphasized team teaching. Modules of time were kept flexible and variable. Instructional organization of participants varied from the total group, to small groups, to private consultation with individuals. Leadership in the sessions varied from staff dominance to active leadership by participants.

An important aspect of the total workshop was that each person, staff or participant, needed the active support of other members of the group. This "helping relationship" was demonstrated by the comments of participants regarding staff members as being sensitive and extremely good listeners. Methods of instruction emphasized the transition of outer-directed behavior models for teachers to self-directedness--that solutions to problems and improvement of teaching in any environment is possible and is the responsibility of the teacher.

Evaluation of the teaching staff was in four areas:

A. The knowledge of the staff member in subject materials, resource information and understanding of subject areas;

B. The methodology used in presentations or working with small groups, individuals or the total group;

C. Planning of the workshop to enable maximum use of participant time in the workshop; and

D. The degree of understanding and sensitivity to the problems of teachers in the workshop.

Rating of the teaching staff in all four of the categories:

TABLE III

Evaluation of the Teaching Staff

Categories	Excellent 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	N	X
A Subject matter	f 20	6	0	0	26	3.6
B Methodology	f 12	11	1	0	24	3.3
C Planning	f 8	9	6	0	23	3.0
D Sensitivity	f 17	6	1	0	24	3.7

Ranged from a mean of 3.0 to 3.7, the lowest being planning for the effective use of the participant's time.

The perception of the staff as compared to the perception of the participant in the use of time was seemingly quite different. Participants had to be warned about returning to class after lunch period at the correct time and about arriving at the classroom at the correct time. Punctuality improved; but, relationships were made considerably more difficult in attempting to achieve unity within the group.

Participants generally perceived the staff to be most helpful and well informed. Some persons indicated the desire that they had hoped that the staff would present information and give more opinions rather than act as facilitators of discussions and group sessions.

IV. THE WORKSHOP RATING

Participants rated the total workshop on a five-point scale

(excellent, good, adequate, poor, very poor). Ratings were very high; on the five-point scale, the mean was 4.7.

TABLE IV

Workshop Rating

	Rating	Frequency	X
Excellent	5	19	
Good	4	6	
Adequate	3		
Poor	2		
Very Poor	1		
	N=25		4.7

Reasons given for this rating by participants include:

A. New information.

B. Understanding community problems.

C. New skills.

D. Development of sensitivity to other's problems.

E. Teaching techniques.

F. Altered attitudes towards students.

G. Evaluation strategies.

H. More could have been accomplished if more had been planned.

I. Expertise of staff in a variety of areas.

J. Depth and variety of activities and discussions.

K. I've grown.

L. Increased concern for my fellow human beings.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 1971 WORKSHOP

Recommendations from the participants and staff were solicited and written into the final report for the 1971 workshop. The staff has attempted to implement and rectify some of these problems or recommendations.

Participant recommendations were:

1. Field trips to schools working with disadvantaged students.

   ANS. A trip was made to the vocational diagnostic center in Baltimore County. No students were present; but, the director of the project explained in detail the program and the purpose of the mobile diagnostic unit.

2. Extend the workshop time.

   ANS. The length of workshop time was kept the same, four weeks based on staff limitations and evaluation of the summer 71 workshop. The summer 72 workshop may have profited from an additional week or two because of the relative long period required to accomplish group unity.

3. Use time more efficiently.

   ANS. The staff began class at the stated time both in the morning and in the afternoon. Participants could improve punctuality and attendance. The goal of transferring the workshop from a directed experience to a teacher-oriented experience seemingly results in considerable lag time before participants view their new role.

4. Involve administrators and supervisors.

   ANS. This was discussed in several meetings at different levels, but no conclusions or recommendations were reached.

5. Include more high school students in the workshop.

   ANS. It is very difficult to obtain a number of students during the summer. This could more readily be implemented during the school continuation program.

6. Discuss the "gripe" sessions.

   ANS. In the best judgment of the staff the large "gripe" sessions are essential to reach new levels of behavior. This is an opportunity to examine values, attitudes and release pent-up emotions.

7. More reference books for the participants.

   ANS. The number of books given participants did not increase, primarily because of cost. A large portion of the supply budget was expended in increasing the library holdings for the participants.

Staff recommendations were:

1. Strategies for implementation into the parent school.

   ANS. The present contract calls for 18 meetings, nine in each of the two participating schools, to be held during the 1972-73 academic year. This time may only serve as an opportunity to explore possibilities for greater involvement.

2. Define a "unique" vocational school.

   ANS. This seems to be a good term; but, upon questioning persons in leadership roles, the answer is still to come.

3. Development of means for on-going consultants.

   ANS. This is being attempted per answer to item one.

4. Develop new channels of outside agency support.

   ANS. The workshop emphasized the use of outside agencies by inviting various representatives to the workshop. Participation and cooperation at this level has been excellent but it is most doubtful that anything has happened in development of greater articulation between organizations.

5. Involve administrators and supervisors.

   ANS. Same response as item 4 under participants.

6. Solve areas of communication between administrators and teachers.

   ANS. It seems rather difficult to continually work only with teachers and hope to solve this problem. Avenues for participation by administrators must be developed.

7. Evaluate effect of workshop on school.

   ANS. No effective evaluation has been attempted or really discussed. Informal feedback from one administrator was that it seemingly assisted in getting the year off much more smoothly.

8. Examine committees in schools to determine effectiveness in solving problems.

   ANS. Feedback from informal meetings on 71 workshop would tend to indicate that the returning participants encountered considerable resistance. Participants from the other school were unable to muster support to become effective.

9. Develop workshops using specific skills available in the Baltimore City School System.

   ANS. It would appear that no effort has been expended in this direction.

SUMMATION: A teacher based workshop differs significantly from a content-based workshop. One is premised on the attempt to promote the development of the individual so as to become a more effective teacher, the later emphasizes specific knowledge or skills which can be taught others. An analysis of the nine goals of this workshop reveals a heavy emphasis on affective domains. Words such as sensitivity, value system, behavior, relationship, cooperation and understanding are basic to a majority of the goals. Other goals list much simpler tasks, such as: write behavior objectives, develop instructional programs and try instructional methods. A workshop which emphasizes the growth of the teacher presents considerable difficulty for effective evaluation. Models for affective evaluation appear to develop extremely "soft" data for persons seeking concrete information.

A subjective evaluation of the workshop model leads one to tentatively conclude that:

1. It allows the opportunity for the examination of "self" in terms of values, attitudes and mores in an atmosphere of support and concern.

2. The perception of the workshop held by all participants for the past two summers is that it has been very helpful.

3. The workshop has received support from all participants, staff and supervisory personnel, and especially Mrs. Geister from Baltimore City.

4. Participants have said that it promotes personal growth and intellectual growth in a non-threatening manner.

5. This inservice workshop model could serve to effect necessary changes in people which could resultantly change teaching behavior.

The following information is available for examination:

1. Test instrument and responses from the 71 workshop.

2. Three weekly evaluation instruments and responses from the 72 workshop.
3. Three tapes of approximately two hours duration dealing with staff and participant evaluation of the 72 workshop.
4. The final test instrument and responses for the 72 workshop.
5. Budget for the workshop.